

*Margaret R. Ward*  
*3109 Summit Court*  
*Little Rock, Arkansas 72227*

February 3, 2012

Ms. Marlene Dortch, Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: IB Docket No. 11-109

Dear Ms. Dortch:

I appreciate the opportunity to comment in support of LightSquared's proposed mobile broadband network and its Petition for Declaratory Ruling.

I am an engineer by training and work in the healthcare industry in Arkansas, a rural state that is ranked near the bottom in the nation for broadband connectivity. Expanding high-speed Internet access to all Arkansans is something about which I feel strongly. Poor access not only puts our citizens at a disadvantage, but it impairs our state's ability to attract industry and development. My family and I have felt the impact, too. When recently looking to buy land for a new home, we had to eliminate desirable areas from consideration because the area lacked any broadband access. These areas were all within commuting distance of the metropolitan Little Rock area. I was surprised and quite disappointed that so much of our area, within commuting distance of the capitol city of Arkansas, is without broadband access.

Another pressing state-wide issue for Arkansas is scarcity in many areas of medical care providers, particularly specialists and subspecialists. Telemedicine is emerging as an effective and efficient means of providing access to critically needed healthcare. As telemedicine grows, broadband access will become even more important to the health and safety of residents of rural Arkansas. This is an issue that **MUST** be addressed, and LightSquared's network would help.

LightSquared's network would no-doubt increase competition and innovation in the wireless industry, while advancing the Commission's goal of expanding the nation's wireless broadband capacity and reaching underserved communities. This would be done without using a penny of taxpayer money. It would be a shame to allow special interests – the GPS industry – to block the network by claiming rights it doesn't have.

LightSquared has played by the rules, following regulatory procedures and processes for a decade as it prepared its licensed spectrum for this network. When interference concerns have been raised, the company has taken steps to address them. In 2011 alone, for example, it voluntarily altered its deployment plan, reduced the power of its signals,

contracted with GPS manufacturers to develop technologies that would solve the interference problems and offered to pay for government-owned GPS receivers to be upgraded – all good-faith efforts aimed at co-existing with GPS.


Contrarily, GPS manufacturers have known for years that terrestrial operations were coming to the spectrum in question, and they continued to manufacture and sell receivers that would experience interference outside of the GPS band in the predictable event that LightSquared use its spectrum as it was authorized to do.

The fact remains, GPS receivers are not licensed to operate outside of GPS-allocated spectrum. When receivers are designed to listen in on spectrum outside of GPS-allocated spectrum, their manufacturers are responsible for installing filters to deal with interference arising from legitimate uses inside that particular spectrum. Instead, the GPS industry is acting like a squatter camping out in a family's backyard, then refusing to leave.

The rules are clear, and so is the logical move forward. LightSquared should be authorized to commence operations in the spectrum it is licensed to use, and the GPS industry should install filters to deal with interference if it chooses to operate in spectrum it is not licensed to use.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to share my view on this important issue.

Sincerely,



Margaret R. Ward